

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 6-11 are newly added. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found in the published specification at numbered paragraph [0018] and in Fig. 2, for example. Support for new Claim 6 can be found in paragraph [0015], for example. Support for newly added Claim 7 can be found in paragraph [0021], for example. Support for new Claim 8 can be found in paragraphs [0019] and [0021], for example. Support for newly added Claims 9 and 10 can be found in paragraph [0033], for example. Support for new Claim 11 can be found in paragraph [0018], for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, and 5 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as obvious over Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of copending application No. 10/271,788. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Riboud (U.S. Patent No. 3,417,418, herein “Riboud”) in view of Wood (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,038, herein “Wood”). Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Riboud in view of Wood and Shizuno et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0088928, herein “Shizuno”).

At the outset, Applicants note with appreciation the courtesy of a personal interview granted to Applicants’ representative by Examiner Patricia Nordmeyer. The substance of the discussion with the Examiner is summarized below and in conjunction with the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Nordmeyer in accordance with MPEP § 713.04.

Regarding the provisional rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 5 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of copending

Application No. 10/271,788, that rejection will be addressed when claims are finalized in the copending application and a Notice of Allowance is received in one application.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 as obvious over Riboud in view of Wood, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites:

An adhesive roll cleaner comprising:
a core tube including an axis of rotation and a plurality
of adhesive tapes,
each of the adhesive tapes including an adhesive applied
to one side thereof to form an adhesive portion,
each of the adhesive tapes being helically wound around
the core tube in a layered configuration with the adhesive
portion out,
each of the adhesive tapes being wound with a gap of
prescribed width between every adjacent turn, and
the adhesive tape which is located at the upper layer
having a larger width as measured in a direction parallel to the
axis of rotation than that of the adhesive tape which is located
at the lower layer.

Accordingly, the adhesive tape located in an upper layer has **a larger width as measured in a direction parallel to the axis of rotation** of the core tube than that of the adhesive tape which is located at a lower layer. One non-limiting embodiment of the above-noted feature is shown in Fig. 2 where W1 indicates a width at a lower layer as measured in a direction parallel to the axis of rotation of the cylindrical core tube (2). W2 is a width of a layer above the layer corresponding to the width W1. W3 is a width corresponding to an uppermost layer. W3 is larger than W2. W2 is larger than W1.

One benefit of the above-noted arrangement is that, when a user peels off a soiled outermost adhesive tape to expose a fresh adhesive surface, the underlying adhesive tape is effectively prevented from accompanying the tape being peeled off. Thus, the risk of double peeling is reduced.¹

¹ See published specification, numbered paragraph [0015].

In contrast, Riboud is devoid of an upper layer having a larger width than a lower layer. The outstanding Office Action acknowledges this at page 4.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Wood for the feature of an upper layer having a larger width than an adhesive tape which is located at a lower layer.² However, as discussed in the personal interview, Wood as shown in Figs. 2 and 4, describes changing lengths of a sheet in a direction of rotation of a wrapped roll (10). The sheets described in Wood change length in a direction perpendicular to an axis of rotation rather than parallel to an axis of rotation. Accordingly, Wood fails to disclose adhesive tape located at an upper layer and having a larger width as measured in a direction parallel to the axis of rotation than that of adhesive tape which is located at a lower layer as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, Wood does not suggest the different widths measured in a **direction parallel to the axis of rotation** of the core tube because the sheets described in Wood are not spirally wound, and therefore, cannot have different widths as measured in the direction recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any reasonable combination of Riboud and Wood for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from amended independent Claim 1 and patentably distinguish over any reasonable combination of Riboud and Wood for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 does.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 4 and 5 as obvious over Riboud, Wood, and Shizuno, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

² Outstanding Office Action, page 5.

Claims 4 and 5 each depend from amended independent Claim 1 and patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Riboud and Wood for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 does.

Shizuno fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above regarding Riboud and Wood. The outstanding Office Action relies on Shizuno for the feature of a specific gap width and adhesive tapes having a tear strength of 500 mN or greater as measured with an Elmendorf tear test in accordance with JIS P8116. However, Shizuno is devoid of adhesive tapes that vary in width such that a tape located at an upper layer has a larger width as measured in a direction parallel to an axis of rotation of a roll than that of an adhesive tape located at a lower layer as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no reasonable combination of Wood, Riboud and Shizuno would include all of the features recited in amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 5 depending from amended independent Claim 1 patentably distinguish over any reasonable combination of the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Newly added Claims 6-10 depend from amended independent Claim 1 and patentably distinguish over any proper combination of the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 does.

Newly added independent Claim 11 recites

An adhesive roll cleaner comprising:
a core tube including an axis of rotation and a plurality of adhesive tapes arranged into first, second, and third groups, all of the adhesive tapes within the first group having a first width, all of the adhesive tapes of the second group having a second width, and all of the adhesive tapes of the third group having a third width, all widths measured along the axis of rotation,
each of the adhesive tapes including an adhesive applied to one side thereof to form an adhesive portion,
each of the adhesive tapes being helically wound around the core tube in a layered configuration with the adhesive portion out,
each of the adhesive tapes being wound with a gap of prescribed width between every adjacent turn,

the first group being positioned closer to the axis of rotation than the second group, and the second group being positioned closer to the axis of rotation than the third group, and

the first width is less than the second width, and the second width is less than the third width.

Accordingly, the first, second, and third groups all have different widths as measured in the direction of the axis of rotation.

As discussed above, Wood does not disclose sheets of different widths as measured in the direction of the axis of rotation of the roll, and none of the remaining references remedies this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that newly added independent Claim 11 patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Consequently, in light of the above-discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


J. Derek Mason
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 35,270

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,837

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)